UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/084,106	02/27/2002	Robert Allan Unger	SNY-R4976	6776	
	7590 03/02/201 ENT SERVICES	EXAMINER			
2500 DOCKER		SHANG, ANNAN Q			
RALEIGH, NC	2/000		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2424		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/02/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/084,106	UNGER, ROBERT ALLAN		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	ANNAN Q. SHANG	2424	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 December 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beth appeal; and/or 	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Annan O Chang/		
	/Annan Q Shang/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2424	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 12/09/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the rejection of the last office action mailed 10/16/09, Applicant discusses the prior arts of record and further argues that the prior arts of record do not teach the claims limitations and that the Examiner has over-broadened the actual disclosure of the Blatter reference and that the secondary reference, Herley does not overcome the deficiencies in Blatter (see page 11+ of Applicant's Remarks).

In response, Examiner notes Applicant's arguments, however, Examiner disagrees. Blatter teaches Head end "HE", Broadcaster "BC", Transport System "TS" 25; constructing a program association table (PAT) that associates programs with primary PIDs; constructing a plurality of program map tables (PMT), one for each program in the PAT (col.2, lines 38-65, col.3, lines 46-49, col.4, line 35-col.5, line 54, col.8, line 16-53 and col.9, line 23-col.10, line 1+). The HE, BC or TS-25, constructs a lookup table that maps at least one primary PID (Base PID) that identifies a portion of a program (Broadcast programs) encrypted under a first encryption system to at least one shadow PID that identifies a duplicate of the same portion of the program encrypted under a second encryption system (col.2, lines 38-65, col.3, lines 46-49, col.4, line 35-col.5, line 54, col.8, line 16-53 and col.9, line 23-col.10, line 1+); and broadcasting the PAT, the PMTs and the lookup table over the content delivery medium (col.3, lines 46-49, col.4, line 35-col.5, line 54 and col.7, line 62-col.8, line 67 and col.9, line 23-col.11, line 1+). Blatter teaches that the CAT holds encrypted codes of the PIDs (the Base PID and Base PID-offset value) of the program and where the TS-25 further and multiplexes the data over a communication medium to various devices (Computers, HDTV Receivers, various types storage devices, etc.) on the network. Blatter further discloses Transport System (TS) 25 (a Gateway Server or Broadcast Server), which further receives these encrypted MPEG streams decrypts that packets for presentation and further creates or generates PIDs, PAT, PMTs, CATs, etc., and further encrypts the data for stored/retrieval and further performs various processes of encrypting/decrypting of the data packets for communication and presentation on devices on the network. Blatter discloses encrypting broadcast programs two or more times, but does not clearly disclose that the same portion of the program is encrypted under a second encryption system. However, in the same field of endeavor Herley disclose method and apparatus for partial encryption of content where same portion of the program is encrypted two or more times (figs.2-5, Abstract, page 1, [0010-0013] and [0020-0031]). Applicant arguments are not persuasive. The rejection using the prior arts of record is proper meets all the claims limitations. This finality of the last office action is proper and maintained.

/Annan Q Shang/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2424